

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/600,297	07/13/2000	JIAN HU	13267.2USWO	13267.2USWO 2701.	
23552 7	590 07/18/2006		EXAMINER		
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903			TRUONG, THANHNGA B		
	IS, MN 55402-0903		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2135		

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

`			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/600,297	HU ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanhnga B. Truong	2135	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 June 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS API	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or
 a)	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ን).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension : (2) final Office action; or final	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any each Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal (of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re		,
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 		e, timely filed amendn	nent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:) will not be entered, or b) wovided below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	out before or on the date of filing a l nd sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will govit or other evidence	not be entered is necessary
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).
To. The anique of other evidence is entered. An explanati	on or the status of the claims after	citing is below of atta	O.104.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

13. Other: ____.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

See Continuation Sheet.

11.

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that:

"Neither Turk nor Yasukawa discloses or suggests means for decoding the encoded data item to retrieve the data item from the separately stored parts, whereby the data item is retrievable even if some of the part are lost or corrupted."

Examiner disagrees with the applicant and still maintain that:

"private key" is a mathematical key which is kept private to the owner and which is used to create digital signatures, and in the context of encrypted communications, is used to decrypt electronic data encrypted with the corresponding public key (column 4, lines 1-5 of Turk).

Although Turk teaches ecoin to be encrypted for security, Turk is silent about encrypting ecoins into a plurality of parts or portions or segments and storing them separately in storage sites. On the other hand, Yasukawa teaches:

The encrypted digital information is stored in a file, but individual segments of data which make up the file are encrypted according to some chosen encryption pattern. The data segments encrypted represent logical segments corresponding to an actual portion of the physical media on which the file is stored (e.g. sectors on a CD-ROM, hard disk, a memory block, etc). The encrypted information includes data indicating the original proprietor of the original digital information (i.e. the original file in which the digital information is stored - wherein the original file can be a complete file, partial or corrupted file) (column 3, lines 43-52 of Yasukawa).

Applicant further argues that:

"Caroll fails to disclose or suggest decoding an encoded item to retrieve the item from separately stored parts, whereby the item is retrievable even if some of the parts are lost or corrupted, as recited by claim 33."

Examiner disagrees with the applicant and still maintains:

A system including a secure server and processes enabling operating system integration through virtual logon and user data encrypted in "personal vaults" (column 1, lines 54-57 of Caroll). Furthermore, protection of data stored in a personal vault 40 includes encryption, digital signatures, and digital certificates (column 6, lines 6-7 of Caroll).

Although Caroll teaches the claimed subject matter, Caroll is silent about encrypting data/item into a plurality of parts or portions or segments and storing them separately in storage sites. On the other hand, Yasukawa teaches:

The encrypted digital information is stored in a file, but individual segments of data which make up the file are encrypted according to some chosen encryption pattern. The data segments encrypted represent logical segments corresponding to an actual portion of the physical media on which the file is stored (e.g. sectors on a CD-ROM, hard disk, a memory block, etc). The encrypted information includes data indicating the original proprietor of the original digital information (i.e. the original file in which the digital information is stored - wherein the original file can be a complete file, partial or corrupted file) (column 3, lines 43-52 of Yasukawa).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the combination of teachings between Turk and Yasukawa & Caroll and Yasukawa are sufficient.

Thus, Turk and Yasukawa & Caroll and Yasukawa do not need to disclose anything over and above the invention as claimed in order to render it unpatentable or anticipate. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claimed limitations.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

HOSUK SONG PRIMARY EXAMINER